



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,382	06/20/2003	Brian J. Cragun	ROC920030127US1	8521
46797 7590 09/18/2009 IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1 3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829				
EXAMINER				
HICKS, MICHAEL J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2165				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/18/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/600,382
Filing Date: June 20, 2003
Appellant(s): CRAGUN ET AL.

Gero G. McClellan
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 6/15/2009 appealing from the Office action mailed 12/12/2008.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

7,162,691	Chatterjee et al.	09-2007
7,152,072	Dobrowski et al.	12-2006

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 10, 13-14, 22 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chatterjee et al. (US 7,162,691 B1) in view of Dobrowski et al. (US 7,152,072 B2).

As per claim 10 Chatterjee et al. is directed to a computer implemented method of managing annotations for a plurality of different type data objects, comprising: receiving a set of parameters identifying an annotated data object, wherein the

identifying parameters identify locations of the annotated data object (Chatterjee et al., column 1, lines 42-47); selecting, based on the set of identifying parameters, a mapping from a plurality of mappings, each containing a different set of mapping functions (Chatterjee et al., column 5, lines 30-35); and creating an index for the annotated data object by mapping the identifying parameters to columns in an index table, as specified by the mapping functions of the selected mapping, (Chatterjee et al., column 1, lines 38-40; column 6, lines 44-51).

Chatterjee et al. does not explicitly teach wherein the mapping functions for each mapping are designed to map a different set of identifying parameters to columns in the index table.

Chatterjee et al. does teach mappings depending on media type association (Chatterjee et al., column 1, lines 42-46; column 3, lines 48-50)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mappings depending on media type association because Chatterjee et al. teaches different media types wherein different media-types could contain different amount and type of parameters (Chatterjee et al., column 4, lines 56-62).

Chatterjee et al. does not teach wherein the mapping functions of at least one of the mappings maps more than one identifying parameter to a single column.

Dobrowski et al. does teach wherein the mapping functions of at least one of the mappings maps more than one identifying parameter to a single column (.Dobrowski et al.; figure 4, column 8, lines 44-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Chatterjee et al. by teachings of Dobrowski et al. to include wherein the mapping functions of at least one of the mappings maps more than one identifying parameter to a single column because entering parameters into one column clusters information about the object in efficient manner.

As per claim 13 Chatterjee et al. as modified is directed to wherein the more than one identifying parameters are mapped to different sets of bytes in the single column (Dobrowski et al.; figure 4, wherein each line is different sets of bytes).

As per claim 14 Chatterjee et al. as modified is directed to at least one of the mappings comprises mapping functions for mapping parameters identifying annotated data objects associated with a database to the index table columns (column 1, lines 38-40), at least one of the mappings comprises mapping functions for mapping parameters identifying annotated data objects associated with a text document to the index table columns (column 1, lines 41-50).

As per claim 22 Chatterjee et al. as modified still is directed to wherein at least one of the mappings comprises mapping functions for mapping parameters identifying data objects associated with a text document to the index table columns (column 1, lines 41-50).

As per claim 28 Chatterjee et al. is directed to a computer implemented method of managing annotations for a plurality of different type data objects, comprising: receiving a set of parameters identifying an annotated data object, wherein the identifying parameters identify locations of the annotated data object (Chatterjee et al., column 1, lines 42-47); selecting, based on the set of identifying parameters, a mapping from a plurality of mappings, each containing a different set of mapping functions, wherein at least one of the mappings comprises mapping functions for mapping parameters identifying annotated data objects associated with a database to the index table columns, and at least one of the mappings comprises mapping functions for mapping parameters identifying annotated data objects associated with a text document to the index table columns (Chatterjee et al., column 5, lines 30-35); and creating an index for the annotated data object by mapping the identifying parameters to columns in an index table, as specified by the mapping functions of the selected mapping (Chatterjee et al., column 1, lines 38-40; column 6, lines 44-51).

Chatterjee et al. does not explicitly teach wherein the mapping functions for each mapping are designed to map a different set of identifying parameters to columns in the index table.

Chatterjee et al. does teach mappings depending on media type association (Chatterjee et al., column 1, lines 42-46; column 3, lines 48-50)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mappings depending on media type association because Chatterjee et al. teaches different media types wherein different media-types could

Art Unit: 2165

contain different amount and type of parameters (Chatterjee et al., column 4, lines 56-62).

Chatterjee et al. does not teach wherein the mapping functions of at least one of the mappings maps more than one identifying parameter to a single column.

Dobrowski et al. does teach wherein the mapping functions of at least one of the mappings maps more than one identifying parameter to a single column (Dobrowski et al.; figure 4, column 8, lines 44-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Chatterjee et al. by teachings of Dobrowski et al. to include wherein the mapping functions of at least one of the mappings maps more than one identifying parameter to a single column because entering parameters into one column clusters information about the object in efficient manner.

(10) Response to Argument

As per Appellants arguments asserting that the combination of Chatterjee and Dobrowski fail to teach, show, or even suggest the limitations of “selecting, based on the set of identifying parameters, a mapping from a plurality of mappings, each containing a different set of mapping functions” and “creating an index for the annotated data object by mapping the identifying, parameters to columns in an index table, as specified by the mapping functions of the selected mapping”, Examiner respectfully disagrees and asserts that the sections of Chatterjee cited in the Final Rejection and reiterated in Appellants arguments clearly disclose these limitations.

Firstly, Examiner asserts that Chatterjee clearly discloses “selecting, based on the set of identifying parameters, a mapping from a plurality of mappings, each containing a different set of mapping functions.” Appellants first argument regarding this limitation, found on Page 11 of the instant Appeal Brief, asserts that Chatterjee, Column 5, Lines 30-35, as cited in the Final Rejection, discloses only identifying different types of media files based on a MIME type. Examiner agrees that the cited section of does

disclose identifying different types of media files based on a MIME type, but strongly asserts that this is not the extent of the teaching of the cited section. Examiner notes that it is plainly stated in Chatterjee, Column 5, Lines 30-35 that the type and format of the media data may also be determined by a registered type designation associated with the file extension in the URL, or by format-identifying characteristics of the media data itself. Examiner asserts that, when taken as a stand alone excerpt, the citation teaches at least that different types of media files are identified based on a set of identifying parameters (e.g. a registered type designation associated with the file extension in the URL, or by format-identifying characteristics of the media data itself), and, when viewed in the context of the full disclosure of Chatterjee, or even in the context of the further excerpts of Chatterjee cited by Appellant on Pages 12 (Chatterjee, Column 1, Lines 28-41) and 13 (Chatterjee, Column 6, Lines 44-51) of the instant Appeal Brief, it becomes clear that the type of media data is identified for the express purpose of extracting descriptive metadata from the media data. Examiner strongly asserts that this process of extracting metadata from the media data includes selecting a mapping from a plurality of mappings, each containing a different set of mapping functions, wherein each mapping identifies the location of metadata for a specific media data type. Chatterjee, Column 6, Lines 20-35 makes this clear in disclosing that "...using the filename extension media-type specifier in the URL to select a media-format-type specific routine to extract descriptive information from the content of the identified media data, that descriptive information may then be appended at 42 to the other annotations which describe the media data..." and "The type-specific media

extraction of metadata embedded in the digital media is performed at 40 according to the file format specifications for the particular type of media file being processed. The type-specific file format specifications define the structure of the media data and indicate where metadata of interest is located within the media data, allowing it to be extracted at 40, transformed into a standard text-based format, preferably XML, and appended to the other annotations...". Examiner strongly asserts that a plurality of "media-format-type specific routine[s] to extract descriptive information from the content of the identified media data" which "indicate where metadata of interest is located within the media data, allowing it to be extracted" selected based on "registered type designation associated with the file extension in the URL, or by format-identifying characteristics of the media data itself" clearly anticipates "selecting, based on the set of identifying parameters, a mapping from a plurality of mappings each containing a different set of mapping functions."

Secondly, Examiner asserts that Chatterjee clearly discloses "creating an index for the annotated data object by mapping the identifying parameters to columns in an index table, as specified by the mapping functions of the selected mapping." Examiner notes Chatterjee, Column 1, Lines 28-41, as cited by Appellant on Page 12 of the instant Appeal brief, which clearly states that the extracted metadata, after being added to a webpage as annotation data, is indexed and that Chatterjee, Column 1, Lines 28-41 clearly states that the index stores the association between the original web page and the metadata which was extracted. Examiner asserts that in order to store such an

association in the index, the extracted metadata itself must be stored in the index.

Examiner further notes that the limitation of "mapping the identifying parameters to columns in an index table" does not strictly indicate that the parameters must be used as column headings in the index table (i.e. the parameter data is used to label columns in the index table), as Appellant appears to argue on Page 13 of the instant Appeal Brief, but rather may be reasonably interpreted to indicate that the parameter data is stored within columns of the index table (i.e. a column of the index table is populated with the parameter data). Examiner strongly asserts that Chatterjee's disclosure that specific information is extracted based on mappings (as per the above arguments) for the purposes of indexing and then subsequently inserted into an index table (e.g. into columns of the index table) during the indexing process clearly anticipates the limitation of "creating an index for the annotated data object by mapping the identifying parameters to columns in an index table, as specified by the mapping functions of the selected mapping."

As per Appellants arguments asserting that the Dobrowski fails to teach the limitation of "'maps more than one identifying parameter to a single column", Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner asserts that Figure 4, and Column 8, Lines 44-47 of Dobrowski, as cited in the Final Rejection, clearly disclose this limitation. Examiner notes that Figure 4 clearly illustrates a system of defining a mapping wherein multiple parameters (Item 112) may be mapped to a single selected column (Item 115). Examiner notes that the disclosure of Column 8, Lines 44-47 supports Figure 4, and

asserts that the Teachings of Chatterjee and Dobrowski may be properly combined for the reasons stated in the Final Rejection.

In view of the above arguments, which address each of Appellants arguments, Examiner asserts that the rejection of Claims 10, 13-14, 22 and 28 Under USC 103(a) in view of Chatterjee in view of Dobrowski is proper and should be maintained.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J Hicks/

Examiner, Art Unit 2165

Conferees:

Neveen Abel-Jalil

/Naveen Abel-Jalil/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165

James Trujillo

/James Trujillo/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2159